

Appln. No. 10/789,596  
Amendment dated August 3, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed July 1, 2004

### REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 through 8 remain in this application. Claim 2 has been cancelled.

The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

#### Paragraph 1 of the Office Action

The drawings have been objected to.

Submitted under separate cover and addressed to the Examiner is applicant's proposed amendment of the drawing. Specifically, in Figure 1 of the drawings as originally filed, the right hand occurrence of reference number "18" has been changed to reference number "16", additionally an arrowhead has been added to the lead line for reference number "10".

In light of the proposed drawing amendment, it is therefore submitted that the objection to the drawings as originally filed has been overcome, and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

#### Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action

Claims 1 and 5-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,039,292 to Danzyger et al., hereinafter Danzyger.

Claim 1, particularly as amended, requires "said base member comprising a receiving aperture, said receiving aperture extending through said base member, said receiving aperture being adapted for receiving the computer mouse such that said base member extends around a periphery of a lower portion of the computer mouse, said base member being adapted for frictionally engaging the computer mouse to selectively couple said base member to the computer mouse, said receiving aperture being adapted for permitting the computer mouse to function when said base member is

App'n. No. 10/789,596  
Amendment dated August 3, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed July 1, 2004

coupled to the computer mouse". These limitations have been taken from claim 2.

Examiner has indicated in paragraph 5 of the Office Action that the prior art of record fails to teach or adequately suggest the claimed features of claim 2 together with the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, claim 1, by virtue of its incorporation of the limitations of claim 2 and any intervening claims, is believed to be allowable.

Claims 5 through 7 are dependent upon claim 1, particularly as amended, and therefore incorporate the requirements of claim 1. Thus, claims 5 through 7 are also believed to be allowable over the cited reference.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 1 and 5-7 is therefore respectfully requested.

**Paragraph 4 of the Office Action**

Claims 1 and 3-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,788,195 to Rice.

Claim 1, particularly as amended, requires "said base member comprising a receiving aperture, said receiving aperture extending through said base member, said receiving aperture being adapted for receiving the computer mouse such that said base member extends around a periphery of a lower portion of the computer mouse, said base member being adapted for frictionally engaging the computer mouse to selectively couple said base member to the computer mouse, said receiving aperture being adapted for permitting the computer mouse to function when said base member is coupled to the computer mouse". These limitations have been taken from claim 2.

Examiner has indicated in paragraph 5 of the Office Action that the prior art of record fails to teach or adequately suggest the claimed features of claim 2 together with the base claim and any intervening claims.

Appln. No. 10/789,596  
Amendment dated August 3, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed July 1, 2004

Therefore, claim 1, by virtue of its incorporation of the limitations of claim 2 and any intervening claims, is believed to be allowable.

Claims 3 through 7 are dependent upon claim 1, particularly as amended, and therefore incorporate the requirements of claim 1. Thus, claims 3 through 7 are also believed to be allowable over the cited reference.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection of claims 1 and 3-7 is therefore respectfully requested.

**Paragraph 5 of the Office Action**

Paragraph 5 of the Office Action states that claim 2 would be allowable if written into independent form with the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The above amendment incorporates the limitations of claim 2 (in its as-filed form) into the recitation of claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 3 through 7, by virtue of their dependency from amended claim 1, are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

**Paragraph 5 of the Office Action**

Claim 8 is allowed.

Appln. No. 10/789,596  
Amendment dated August 3, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed July 1, 2004

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.

By 

Date: 8/4/04

Robert Hack (Reg. No. 45,761)  
LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.  
3500 South First Avenue Circle, Suite 250  
Sioux Falls, SD 57105-5807  
(605)339-2028 FAX (605)336-1931